UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Government,

MAGISTRATE JUDGE DAVID GRAND

v.

No. 20-30270

DAMONE KEITH ADAMS,

Defendant.

ARRAIGNMENT HEARING

Friday, July 31, 2020

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: EATON BROWN, ESQ. Assistant U.S. Attorney

For the Defendant: DAVID THOLEN, ESQ.

To Obtain Certified Transcript, Contact: Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, Official Court Reporter Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 1067 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 962-1234

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

								2
		_	N	D	•	v		Pa
		Ι			E	Х		
Arraignment hearing								<u>F</u>
Arrarghment hearing	J							
	E	x	н	В	I	T	S	
Identification							Offered	Receiv
	N		0		N		E	
22.222	7.0	TT ~ -		. -	D//		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	7
20-302	/U;	USA	. V.	DΑ	IVIOIN.	ьK	EITH ADAMS	

Detroit, Michigan
Friday, July 31, 2020
THE CLERK: Court calls Case Number 20-30270,
United States of America versus Damone Adams.
MS. BROWN: Good afternoon, your Honor.
Eaton
THE DEFENDANT: It is Damone by the way.
THE CLERK: Sorry.
THE DEFENDANT: No problem.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MS. BROWN: Eaton Brown for the United
States, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. Good afternoon. And
sir, before we go any further, I need to advise you of
certain rights that you have.
You have the right to remain silent, which means
you don't need to say anything to me, or answer any
questions that anyone asks of you. Anything that you say
can be used against you, you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Can other people see the
defendant? I'm not able to see him. I hear him just
fine.

MR. THOLEN: I can see him, Judge. I don't 1 2 know if he needs to leave the break out room. Is that 3 possible? THE CLERK: He's out of the break out room. 4 5 I'm looking at him. THE COURT: I don't see him. I see -- the 6 7 only people that I see is Mr. Flanagan, Ms. Brown and Mr. 8 Tholen. 9 MR. THOLEN: We can all see Mr. Adams, Judge. 10 THE COURT: All right. Any problem if we 11 begin, and if anything comes up, you'll just wave and let 12 me know. 13 THE CLERK: Yes. 14 MR. THOLEN: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Sir, as I was saying, you have the right to remain silent. You don't need to say 16 17 anything or answer any questions, and anything that you 18 say can be used against you, you understand that? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 20 THE COURT: All right. You also have the 21 right to the assistance of an attorney at all critical 22 stages in your case, including any time authorities 23 question you, and any time you are in court, you 24 understand that? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Are you asking the Court appoint an attorney to assist you in this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. I'll appoint the Federal Community Defender Office.

MR. THOLEN: Thank you, your Honor. For the record, David Tholen of that office.

I did have the opportunity in the breakout room to speak with Mr. Adams. We reviewed the nature of his case. He also has been provided a copy of the indictment from North Dakota. I did explain to him the general nature of removal proceedings, and the process that he's entitled to in this district, and he indicated that he does understand that, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Will he be waiving any of his Rule 5 rights in terms of an identity hearing or other rights that he has under those rules?

MR. THOLEN: Well, at this point, Judge, we have not made a final determination about that. I think the only -- because it is an indictment, the process he would be entitled to would be the identity hearing alone.

We do wish to pursue bond in this matter, and so I goes we would like to take that up first.

THE COURT: All right. Well, before we go any further, let me just put a few things on the record.

First sir, we are appearing by Zoom because our courthouse is closed to in-person proceedings, but I have been able to hear you during this whole time and ask you questions, and you have answered them, and obviously you have been able to hear as well. Do you consent to proceeding over Zoom?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. No problem. Not at all.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. If there is any time you don't hear what's being said, speak up, and we'll make sure we call on you.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The next reason that you're here is that an indictment has been issued out of the District of North Dakota against somebody with your exact name, and the allegation is that that indictment is against you, and it charges various narcotic trafficking crimes, and gun crimes. And so that's why you're here, because charges those charges are being made against that person, and that claim is that it is you. Do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: Sort of. A lot of this don't even have nothing to do with me. I understand what's going on, but I never seen no gun, honestly. I've seen a

lot of stuff --

2.0

MR. THOLEN: Your Honor, if I might interject. Mr. Adams and I discussed this, and I explained to him, without getting into the details or the factual allegations, that the main point is that North Dakota believes that he and the other named individuals were involved in various federal crimes. He did indicate to me that he understood that. Obviously, he may not agree with every allegation in the indictment, nor should he.

THE DEFENDANT: I apologize. I didn't mean --

THE COURT: You don't have to apologize. I want to make sure you understand what's going on, and what your rights are.

So I think you understand that, you know, there are charges being made in the North Dakota Federal District Court against somebody with your name, and they're claiming that's you. I have no idea if it is or isn't, but that's why you're here. So you understand at least that much?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Yes, sir. Yes, sir. I apologize.

THE COURT: That's okay. And you also have certain rights being accused of being that person.

Number one, you have the right to what's called an identity hearing, where government would have to show that you are, in fact, the person that is the subject of that indictment. So that's one right that you have.

You also have the right to have a bond hearing before me or a judge of you our court as to whether you ought to be released pending the resolution of your case.

Those are the rights that you have at the present time. And Mr. Tholen, it sounds to me like you need additional time with this individual to explore those rights, and whether he might wish to contest identity, et cetera, is that correct?

MR. THOLEN: Yes. With respect to the identity hearing, I would like more time. With respect to the bond issue, I'm ready to proceed now on that.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the government.

Is the government seeking detention with respect to this individual?

MS. BROWN: Your Honor, we are seeking that the detention hearing be set for Monday, please.

THE COURT: All right. And is Monday the first day that you're able to go forward? You are not able to go forward today?

MS. BROWN: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, under the statute we're entitled to that amount of time as

well.

MR. THOLEN: I understand the government's request, but could I place some comments on the record before the Court makes a final decision on that request?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. THOLEN: Obviously, this was a, quote, late arrest, and I have had the opportunity to speak with Mr. Adams after 1:00. However, it is my understanding that he was arrested at a specific address that's known to be his address in Detroit, Michigan around 10:30 or 11 today. He lives with the mother of his child, and they have together a seven month old son.

What's significant is that the mother of his child is also on this indictment, and the mother of his child has appeared -- apparently she's been contacted first.

She appeared, and has been granted bond on this case from North Dakota through a Zoom proceeding.

Mr. Adams' had attorney Danny Blank from Detroit contact North Dakota and the U.S. Attorneys Office to try to make arrangements for a self-surrender, or to find out if he they were looking to have him appear in North Dakota either personally or through a Zoom proceeding, and they never got back with any clear date, or any decision that something needed to be done.

Mr. Adams, as I understand, was fully cooperative

when he was arrested at his residence today. He identified himself by his true name. He did not resist or struggle with the officers that were placing him under arrest and, you know, on top of everything else, his birthday is this Sunday.

I understand fully that the government has the statutory right to ask for three days. Monday is not even within the full three days, but I think there are some circumstances in this case that might warrant at least starting this hearing, or perhaps the government might reflect and change its position.

It is my understanding that the only prior criminal conviction was for a 2012 domestic violence case, for which Mr. Adams got probation and it was discharge from probation.

And so, a lot of these things can be verified pretty easily, and I understand the allegations in the North Dakota indictment are serious, but I think it is significant that a co-defendant has been placed at a residence with Mr. Adams already, and he's not trying to hide or trying to flee, and I just want to make that pitch on his behalf, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask, has

Pretrial Services interviewed the defendant at this point?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

PRETRIAL SERVICES: Good afternoon, your Honor. The defendant was interviewed, but Pretrial Services wouldn't advise the government would be seeking detention, and we'll have a written report for the detention hearing.

MS. DELI: Your Honor, Susan Deli from

Pretrial Services. I had the opportunity to speak with

Mr. Adams. I also interviewed and spoke with his mother.

The information that I received from Mr. Adams and his

mother, and also conducting a criminal history check,

leads me to believe that there are conditions that

Mr. Adams could be released on that would satisfy the

risk -- the concerns of risk. However, I did not take

factor the charges against him. So to be frank, we would

recommend release today based upon the information that we

received from our initial investigation.

MS. BROWN: Your Honor, if I may?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. BROWN: The situation is we're not asking for Monday because we can. We are asking for it because one, it is an out of district case. So we need time to compile the information, not all of which we've received from AUSA.

Secondly, the fact that he was found with the mother of his child in a house -- I mean, I can't really

speak as to whether or not she violating her bond conditions by doing that, but perhaps nobody knows that they are together.

In any event, when they went to find him, he said to the arresting agent that he was aware that he was wanted, and he was asked to surrender, and he declined to do so because he knew how much jail time he was facing.

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, ma'am. That's --

MS. BROWN: -- I'm going upon the recommendation of the AUSA, but I think when I spoke with the officers who arrested the defendant, I think that information is certainly pertinent for the Court to consider when weighing whether or not to release him.

MR. THOLEN: Judge, obviously -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. THOLEN: May I respond to that?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. THOLEN: Obviously, I haven't seen that in any document because no reports of any arrests have been provided, but I will take Ms. Brown at her word, but I think that information or statement -- or that alleged statement can certainly be taken into consideration with the fact that Mr. Adams took this matter seriously enough to have a very respected long time practitioner in Detroit, Daniel Blank, who has represented Mr. Adams in

the past, reach out as a professional to the U.S.

Attorneys Office in North Dakota to arrange, or to find out how they wanted to handle this, and that office did not respond to Mr. Blank.

So this is not a situation where Mr. Adams blew this situation off, or was trying to hide out from the situation. He did the most responsible thing, which is getting an attorney to make some calls on his behalf, and to try to follow through with this.

So, you know, when I think the relevance for the fact that a co-defendant, the mother of his child, is on bond to that very address, obviously that's all known to the North Dakota Prosecutor's Office and the North Dakota court, and I suspect if they did any kind of pretrial investigation, she revealed that she has a seven month old son with Mr. Adams, the defendant before your Honor now, which also means they know that Mr. Adams is residing with her at that residence.

So, you know, I guess what I'm asking the Court, and it's a little bit unusual, and I understand that the U.S. Attorney's Office in Detroit is acting in concert with the information they are getting from U.S. Attorney's Office in North Dakota, and that's what they professionally do, you know, I would ask if this Court would consider that we started this hearing, and certainly

if the government -- anything the government wants to add, we can continue this hearing to Monday, and I would ask this Court consider releasing Mr. Adams on any conditions, GPS electronic tether, anything the Court thinks is necessary. We are talking about approximately 48 hours, and yet, it seems to me inappropriate -- we've heard from Ms. Deli from Pretrial Services that he does not have a significant prior record, or anything that alarmed Pretrial Services that he should be detained, and it makes me think that it would be highly unfortunate to detain Mr. Adams in this set of circumstances over the weekend just to possibly have him released on Monday.

Fortunately, Pretrial did do an interview. It's been able to review LIEN, the criminal records. I think there's a lot of information here, and certainly the government is well within its right to ask for additional time, but I think there is no reason we can't start hearing now.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't we -- first of all, I want to put on the record I just read through -- each district does their indictment a little different. So they look a little different.

My understanding, Ms. Brown, looking through this indictment, this defendant is not facing a gun charge. Am right about that?

MS. BROWN: It appears not, correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So number one, I want to clarify that because initially when I had advised him of the general nature of the indictment, I did not realize that he was not part of the gun charge, and in fact, he said that, you know, he didn't know anything about a gun. So I just want to point that out.

You know, it is only 2:00 right now. I think we don't have much more on our docket today. Based on what I'm hearing, and especially based on the COVID situation, it seems very likely that based on what I've heard, that the defendant is candidate for bond.

I base that on his lack of significant criminal history; the fact that the charge against him does not involve a firearm, which typically is what causes, you know, the most amount of concern; the fact that his co-defendant wife is already released on bond, and they have baby.

So I'm very much inclined to at least release him on bond, even if it means that we continue the detention hearing until Monday. Put him on a GPS tether, and he'll be back Monday for that.

I also base this on many cases that we have like this that originate out of state, where they may have a different way of doing things that we do in terms of what

their -- you know, I don't know how they view risk of flight, risk of danger and that, although I do note they release the other defendant on bond.

Anyway, I guess what I propose is that we reconvene at 4:30. I think that would give the government plenty of time really find out if there's anything that, you know, significantly differs from what we've heard that would suggest the defendant is such a flight risk or such a danger, that it cannot be addressed through a GPS tether, home incarceration, whatever we need to do, whether it's temporarily or for his regular bond conditions. And that will also give Pretrial Services to do some further investigation and thought, and we'll reconvene at 4:30, and I'll hear from both sides, and make a call at that time as to how we will proceed. How does that sound?

MS. BROWN: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. THOLEN: Thank you, Judge.

THE CLERK: Can we check with the marshals regarding that time?

THE MARSHAL: I have the transport here waiting to take these guys back. So is it possible to hold the hearing from the Midland County Jail?

THE DEFENDANT: Sir, I'm downtown. They came and searched my house. I didn't arque. That's my

mother's home.

THE COURT: Wait a second, sir. Is there -- when are they going to be leaving? Is that Ed?

THE MARSHAL: Yes, sir. They are waiting now. They are on the curb waiting.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know. I mean, I really don't want -- Midland is two hours away due north.

I mean, he's probably 10 minutes from his house.

Ms. Brown, do you want to make a quicker phone call, and see if there's anything significant based on what I said about how I'm leaning?

MS. BROWN: Your Honor, I can ask for the, you know, paperwork. Some of it has just come in since we've been in court, and I can look it over. I mean --

THE COURT: Let's take a 15 minute recess on this matter. I'm really inclined, based on what I've heard, to release him on a bond, and I wouldn't want him to sit in jail over a weekend, and I don't want him to go two hours in the wrong direction for nothing. So --

MS. BROWN: Your Honor, may I say one thing that may influence your decision?

They -- the AUSA feels so strongly, he has asked me to stay the Court's decision so they can appeal it to a judge in North Dakota if you are incline to release him.

I'm just letting you know they let me know that.

THE COURT: Based on what?

MS. BROWN: Based on the fact that they don't agree with your decision.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is the problem, though, is that the government in certain cases, it seems they are not paying careful enough attention to the factors and the evidence, and the fact they can ask for a stay, doesn't mean it should just happen, and the government should have to provide detailed information and evidence about why the Court's decision is incorrect, and why there is clear and convincing evidence that there is no combination of conditions that could reasonably assure the community's safety or his risk of flight, and least so far, I have not heard anything that would suggest that. At this point all I've heard is that he is charged with a drug trafficking crime.

So you know --

MS. BROWN: Your Honor, I'm just telling you that's what they intend to do.

THE COURT: But you're just not the messenger though in this. You're the attorney in this court, and you know, what happens is, I do what I'm suppose to do and follow the law, and then a person ends up going to -- you know, take however long, and then the last time we did this, the judge in other district just released him right

away, and it was just a complete waste of time.

So maybe talk about it with the other attorney from the other district and say, you know, the Judge really wants to hear some evidence that is clear and convincing standard being met. That might be a good use of the time that we're going take this short recess.

MS. BROWN: Happy to do that, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let's take a 15 minute recess on this case.

Are you handling any other cases that we have?

MS. BROWN: I am, your Honor. I'm handling a
matter with Ms. Gardey.

THE COURT: Are we ready to do that one?

THE CLERK: We are, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is this a detention hearing also?

MS. BROWN: It is.

THE COURT: All right. How much time do you need to talk to the AUSA in North Dakota and explain all the circumstances that we just discussed and then to get back to me?

MS. BROWN: I have not tried to call him by phone. So I would have to, you know, call him now, and then, you know, provide he answers. I think he was anticipating the hearing would be Monday. So if he's available, as soon as get off the -- you know, stop the

hearing, I'll be happy to talk to him. 1 2 THE CLERK: Judge, if I may. Mr. Tholen 3 still needs to meet Patrick Johnson. If you wanted to recess for a moment, I can ask that Mr. Tigner leave the 4 room, and Patrick Johnson come in, and Mr. Tholen and him 5 6 can meet. Ms. Brown can make the calls, and then when we 7 do reconvene, we'll be ready to go on everything. 8 MR. THOLEN: Judge, I'm fine with that. I 9 appreciate Aaron's suggestion. 10 THE COURT: All right. These fine. We'll 11 take -- do you think 10 minutes is enough time with the other individuals, Mr. Tholen? 12 13 MR. THOLEN: I do, Judge. 14 THE COURT: All right. We'll take a 10 15 minute recess. 16 17 (Recess taken.) 18 19 (Proceedings resumed.) 20 21 THE CLERK: Your Honor, recalling Case Number 22 20-30270, United States of America versus Damone Keith 23 Adams. 24 THE COURT: The government indicated that 25 they were going to be seeking detention. I heard from

Pretrial Services that they were prepared to release Mr. Adams on bond, and then Ms. Brown was going to follow up with her colleague in North Dakota to get additional details. Go ahead.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, your Honor.

So just by way of factual background, a couple of things that I would indicate to the Court. This is a presumption case. The mandatory minimum on Count 2 is a 20 year mandatory minimum, and given the nature and the weight of the controlled substances that the defendant was distributing in Count 1, that also again makes it a presumption case.

By way of facts, the defendant is a Detroit based distributor of drugs who uses interstate shipping and other means to transport oxycodone, 30 milligrams pills, Fentanyl and heroin from Detroit to North Dakota, which he distributed primarily on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in Bismarck, North Dakota.

He is able to direct others to distribute the opioid drug and communicate with them primarily via Face Time, meaning he can conduct this business from the comfort of his own home.

He transports or uses various means of transport car, train, airline and commercial carrier.

If the Court would like, I can proceed to argument

now based on my conversation with the AUSA of North Dakota. Would you like proceed to argument?

THE COURT: I want to be clear of what's taking place here. Is this the detention hearing at this point, or is the -- or are you just explaining reasons you need Monday to hold the detention hearing because that's what the government asked for initially?

MS. BROWN: Well -- well, my understanding is that the Court wanted to proceed, but -- with the detention hearing. That's what I was doing because the Court was going to deny our request for a continuance of one day to Monday, but if misunderstood --

THE COURT: I wasn't necessarily going -- I did not say that I was denying your request. I wanted to see what the factual basis was A, for the request and B, for the request to have the additional time, and then C, to get a better understanding of what are the facts here such that we would have a better idea of the overall situation.

So, you know, if the government, you know, wants until Monday to hold the hearing, and based on what you have said about additional factual details, you know, I guess I don't know that is, you know, inappropriate given it is 2:30 now. And you know, on the other hand, if the government after looking at it was of a different mind set

that it might not be seeking detention, you know, that would be a different situation.

So the government is still seeking detention?

MS. BROWN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And does the government want until Monday to fully prepare for the detention hearing in this matter?

MS. BROWN: That would be our preference, but if the Court, as indicated previously, was inclined to release him -- I mean, our preference would be to wait until Monday so that we can, you know, be fully prepared. Like I say, all of the salted paperwork came through while I was in court. So I had chance briefly look it over.

But I will tell you a couple facts that have come came to attention that might alleviate your concerns about holding him, and that is when I spoke with the AUSA just know, he informed me both -- that both the lawyer,
Mr. Blank, called out and spoke to the U.S. Attorney for North Dakota directly, who informed Mr. Blank that his client needed to turn himself in. And then the next day, the defendant called the AUSA directly, and they had a conversation, and the AUSA told the defendant he needed to turn himself in.

So there was no question in Mr. Adams' mind -this was July 1st and July 2nd -- that for the last almost

a month he has been wanted.

2.0

THE DEFENDANT: Ma'am, that is a lie. Ma'am, that is a lie. People told me they would return my phone call and never did.

MR. THOLEN: Mr. Adams, you shouldn't say anything.

THE COURT: Wait a second, sir.

Okay. I'm going -- I am going to, you know, grant the government's request to have until Monday to hold the detention hearing. I really don't want to do that. My strong inference is based on what I have heard, and what my gut reaction is to it all is that bond very much an appropriate in this case, and I really hate to have somebody in custody even over the weekend when I get that feeling.

On the other hand, I think that there are -- have been some questions raised by the government from an evidentiary perspective that the defendant obviously very strongly disagrees with. You know, the government is making certain assertions about phone calls and things like that. And I guess I just also think that it might be in the defendant's best interest to allow his attorney here to work with him between now and Monday to be able to put all of their ducks in a row, their best foot forward to hold that hearing, and it might also lead -- I would

hope it would lead to a conversation between the government counsel and the defense counsel in conjunction with the Pretrial Services recommendation, and hopefully lead to an agreement on bond conditions once everyone can maybe get a little more on the same page about what did and did not happen.

And it just strikes me that's information that the government is entitled to fully explore. I just want them to fully explore it, and then react in good faith. And I'm not pointing the finger right now when I say good faith at all to Ms. Brown.

My concern is in these cases that we have in other districts, where it seems like in our district, the person would very clearly be released where the government would not even seek detention, and then because a AUSA is like nameless, faceless AUSA in some other jurisdiction says we want to appeal, or we want him detained, we go through all of this, and frankly it's just not fair. It's not fair to the defendant if that's how it happened.

Now if it is supported by evidence, and there's, you know, a reasonable argument that clear and convincing evidence shows him to be a danger, or a preponderance of the evidence shows him to be a flight risk, and it could be reasonably be argued either way, you know, then absolutely that is fine.

But I've just seen a lot of cases where it seems like in our court that standard very clearly is not met, and yet, we have to transport the defendant all over the United States just to get to the other location, and more often than not be released there anyway once they are in front of that district judge there.

So I really just want to prevent that from happening, and if taking this weekend to allow further development, further discussion that could potentially result in that kind of an outcome, that would be a much better outcome for the defendant than for me to release him right now, have the government appeal, and then have him shipped to North Dakota, and probably take three plus weeks to get him there.

So I will grant the government's motion for a continuance of the detention hearing until -- well, to hold the detention hearing on Monday. And just so it is clear, I won't be the one holding the detention hearing. I'm just granting the government's motion to hold the detention hearing on Monday, and entering an order of temporary detention until that time, and again, hopefully you all can work out a resolution that makes sense for everybody. Thank you.

MR. THOLEN: Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. THOLEN: I'm sorry. It's David Tholen on behalf of the defendant.

Your Honor, I understand everything that the Court just said. I would ask -- it appears that there have been bond arguments made. I know that I've made bond arguments, and I believe I've heard Ms. Brown make detention arguments, as well as make a request to have the detention hearing set over to Monday.

I would ask if this Court would consider that the hearing has been started. Certainly, I have no objection to the hearing being continued until Monday, but if the Court would make that type of finding, I think that does allow the Court to consider potential release between now and Monday. And for all the reasons I argued earlier, I ask the Court to consider releasing this defendant on bond with the most restrictive conditions possible, and that we reconvene Monday to make a final determination about bond or detention in this matter.

MS. BROWN: May I respond?

THE COURT: You don't need to. You know, I appreciate that request. I appreciate you advocating for your client, and I appreciate how unfortunate it is that under my approach, it means he's going to spend at a minimum, a weekend in jail.

On the other hand, I kind of view that request in

light of the whole -- well, for me to do would really be to place kind of form over substance in this situation, and to kind of dictate a result that I want, and circumventing the process, and I don't do that, even if it is something that I really want, and something that I really think, you know, what should happen. If that's not what's, you know, right under the rules and procedures, then I'm not going to do it.

And I just think what I wanted to see was, okay, what's really going on here? What's the basis for the request for the day? What is the string of the reasonableness of the request, and I think Ms. Brown did what I asked. She went and talked to her colleagues. She got some additional information, and so that really just satisfied me about her request to hold the detention hearing on Monday.

So that's all I'm doing, entering an order of temporary detention. Holding the defendant until Monday. Granting the government's motion to have the one business day to prepare, and I think it will allow the defendant to fully prepare as well, and put his best foot forward with the hearing.

MR. THOLEN: I understand, you Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE CLERK: Mr. Tholen, your client has his

hand up.

THE DEFENDANT: I had my hand up for awhile. I was just letting you guys know when I called down to that office, the lady -- Danny told me specifically to turn myself in. If I turn myself in, North Dakota will move to detain me due to COVID, that I would probably be safer there. That was his exact words. If I'm not mistaken, Danny told me he emailed the people. That's what Danny told me, and I'm probably sure I could get those emails.

When I called down there, the lady told me that the supervisor would get ahold of me, and I never received a phone call ever.

My problem isn't with the charges or -- I'm sorry, sir. I apologize. I'm just trying to speak with you.

THE COURT: You don't have to apologize. I want you to be able to fully present those arguments, and it's -- right now it's 3:00 -- almost 3:00. So I just think also it is -- as much as I don't want to see you sit in jail over the weekend, which is what is going to happen, I would rather you sit in jail over the weekend, which will allow you to put your best foot forward, have all of this evidence that you are referring to, give your attorney an opportunity to speak with you about all of it, track it all down, and then you will present that on

Monday. And I don't take it lightly that it means you'll be in jail for two days, but it is better than --

THE DEFENDANT: It's not about the two days, your Honor. It's really, like I was telling the pretrial agent and my lawyer, I just had my first child. My birthday is Sunday. Like, this stuff is just getting started, like a few of these people on this list is being picked up, already. I don't want to go through the proceeds with my son. You get what I'm saying?

Like I say, this is probably the only birthday he's going to spend with me. Me, him and my dad, we all got the same names. It's kind of an important thing to me. That's what I was telling the lawyer and Pretrial Services.

I'm not a flight risk. I'm not going anywhere. I stay in the same house that I've always lived in. I've been to college. I don't do anything violent. I never seen any guns or any of that weird stuff. I know what's going on in the city right now. I don't have anything to do with none of that.

I keep to myself. I stay with my family and my child. My child's car seat is in the back car of my car seat. It's there all day everyday, because literally because of this -- you get what I'm saying? I just preparing for the worst or whatever, and this probably

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will be the only birthday I actually get to spend with the little guy, you get what I'm saying, besides seeing behind the glass or something. THE COURT: I don't know. I don't know, sir. You are presumed innocent. Right now I treat you like that. There are certain results that apply. THE DEFENDANT: I understand. THE COURT: The government has rights just like you have rights, and I'm just trying to respect everybody's rights and reach -- take an approach that I think allows you your best opportunity to advocate for yourself, to meet with the attorney, have your attorney advocate for you. So I appreciate everything that you said. My ruling will stay the same. It will be an order of temporary detention. You'll be back Monday at 1:00. And again just in closing, I really hope counsel can figure out a way to come to a consensus about a resolution. It sure seems like that this is one where you should be able to do that. Thank you.

20-30270; USA v. DAMONE KEITH ADAMS

(Proceedings concluded.)

CERTIFICATION

I, Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, official court reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.

s/Ronald A. DiBartolomeo Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, CSR Official Court Reporter _August 17, 2020_ Date